

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application with Claims 1-5 and 7-22 being rejected in the present non-final Office Action.

Claim 6 was objected to for depending on itself and has been amended to correct above informality. Claim 6 now depends from Claim 5. Withdrawal of objection and allowance of Claim 6 is thus respectfully requested.

Rejection under §102

Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,257 (Keeth). Keeth describes a memory circuit, which includes distributed voltage generators to selectively provide power to memory arrays of the memory circuit. Each memory array can be turned off by deactivating its voltage generator if it is determined that the memory array is defective and cannot be repaired. The memory device, therefore, can be salvaged by reducing the operational capacity of the memory device. The distributed voltage generators can be selectively deactivated to test the memory circuit.

Keeth does not disclose, as the Examiner suggests, “a plurality of internal voltage supply generators, each connected to a respective macro of the plurality of macros and configured for receiving the external voltage for generating an internal voltage supply for operating its respective macro” claimed in Claim 1. The Examiner equates Power Isolation Devices 70 of Fig. 1 of Keeth with internal voltage supply generators claimed in Claims 1 and 12.

Keeth, in column 4, lines 23-24 states that “The DRAM has eight memory subarrays 10 which are selectively coupled to global signals VCC 50, DVC2 52, GND 60 and VCCP 62.” VCC50 is the external voltage supply input equated by the Examiner with an external voltage supply input claimed in Claims 1 and 12. Further, in column 4, lines 30-31, Keeth describes “Coupling is accomplished via eight isolation circuits 70, one for each subarray 10.” The purpose of the isolation circuits 70, described in column 5, lines 37-41, is to disable the passing of signals VCC 50, DVC2 52, GND 60 and VCCP 62 to the eight memory subarrays 10.

Keeth simply does not describe nor suggest “a plurality of internal voltage supply generators” claimed in Claims 1 and 12. Moreover, nothing in Keeth suggests or implies, “a

plurality of internal voltage supply generators configured for receiving the external voltage for generating an internal voltage supply for operating its respective macro" claimed in Claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, Keeth does not teach or describe, "the plurality of internal voltage supply generators includes circuitry for generating the internal voltage supply" claimed in Claims 1 and 12.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5, 12-16, 21, and 22, it is submitted that they overcome Keeth by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly it is submitted that Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21, and 22 are patentable over Keeth.

Rejection under §103

Claims 7-11 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,027 (Sher). It is noted that the use of Sher is improper as that patent was issued on December 17, 2002 and its disclosure was unavailable to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made. The requirement of §103 that the content of the prior art is determined "at the time the invention was made" is made to avoid impermissible hindsight MPEP 2141.01 III.

Furthermore, without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 7-11, and 17-20, it is submitted that they overcome Keeth, Sher, and the combination thereof by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly it is submitted that Claims 7-11, and 17-20 are patentable over Keeth in view of Sher.

The examiner further stated that Claim 13 (although the Examiner stated Claim 11 it seems Claim 13 was meant) and Claims 17-20 repeat limitations of Claims 4 and 7-10 respectively. The Applicants believe that such repetition is proper because the original and repeated claims depend from different independent claims, namely Claim 1 and Claim 12.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that pending Claims 1- 22 are believed to be in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484